

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 05 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Mathur

Serial No: **10/822,166**

Group art Unit: **2825**

Filed: **04/09/2004**

Examiner: **Lam, Nelson C.**

Atty. Docket: **CDS-001**

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ELECTION AND TRAVERSE

Sir:

Responsive to the Official Action of May 15, 2006 Applicants hereby submit the following Election with Traverse.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the US Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed as below, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO at 571 273 8300, on the date set forth below.

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: July 5, 2006 (Date)


By _____
(Signature)

A. Election

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant's hereby elect to prosecute Group II claims 5-11, 16 and 17 (method for comparing data flow graphs for equivalence) are stated in the office action to be readable on this elected group.

A request for a one month extension of time is also enclosed herewith

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth in the next section

B. Traverse

In response to the restriction requirement, applicant has elected to prosecute Group II claims 5-11, 16 and 17 (method for comparing data flow graphs for equivalence) which are stated in the office action to be readable on this elected group. The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

The restriction requirement is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that restriction between groups I and II is unduly burdensome and wasteful of the resources of both the applicants and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office by perhaps requiring separate filings, filing fees, office actions, responses, issue fees etc. for the filing of an additional application. It is noted that the inventions of groups I and II, are sufficiently related, and indeed classified in the same class with only the subclasses differing, such that a search of the elected method claims is likely to encompass subclasses 4 and 5 of class 716. Thus the search of the non-elected claims will essentially already been made and to require a possible separate prosecution of the other method claims is unnecessary.

Accordingly removal of the restriction requirement between groups I and II is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions regarding this matter, the Examiner is requested to telephone the applicants' attorney at the numbers listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
William L. Botjer
Reg. No. 27,990
PO Box 478
Center Moriches, NY 11934
(212) 737-5728 (Tue-Thurs)
(631) 874-4826 (Mon & Fri)

Date: July 5, 2006